UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

JOHN HANCOCK LIFE INSURANCE) CA 04-10181
) Boston, MA
V.) February 12, 2004
)
SPHERE DRAKE INSURANCE LIMITED)

BEFORE THE HONORABLE MARK L. WOLF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

Prince, Lobel, Glovsky & Tye by MITCHELL S. KING, ESQ. 585 Commercial St., Boston, MA 02109 for Plaintiff

Butler, Rubin, Saltarelli & Boyd by HAROLD C. WHEELER, ESQ. 3 First National Plaza 70 W. Madison St., Suite 1800 Chicago, IL 60602 for Defendant

JUDITH A. TWOMEY, RPR
Official Court Reporter
One Courthouse Way
Courtroom 10~Room 5200
Boston, MA 02210
(617)946-2577

not ratified those contracts, and they've done the same in the UK for purposes of seeking arbitration in the UK.

THE COURT: I'm not sure what -- this isn't the

time to answer, but -- maybe I'll let them respond -- but I'm not sure what ratified the contracts for the purpose of arbitration means.

MR. KING: There's no question before you, your Honor, as to whether the parties are obliged to arbitrate. So the question becomes -- the both parties

MR. KING: The slips. They agree that -there's a statement from counsel. It's an admission
against the party. There's a statement that says, we
agree the parties are obliged to arbitrate per the slips.
That's their statement. And that's found in the papers.
That's a letter by, I believe, a solicitor from -- reply
from a Mr. Bell, saying: The parties are obliged to
arbitrate under the slips. We maintain it's UK law. You
maintain it's US.

So I think that addresses --

THE COURT: Let's see what Sphere Drake says.

MR. WHEELER: If it please the court, I'm Harold Wheeler on behalf of Sphere Drake.

Your Honor, our position, as the court

recognizes, is that these contracts of reinsurance or punitive contracts of reinsurance are void. We have agreed, both in proceedings here and in proceedings in London, to conduct arbitration in accordance with the guidance of the slips themselves. But we certainly do not ratify the slips. We will continue to maintain both in the course of the arbitrations that they're void.

THE COURT: Well, I haven't studied this. I haven't done an insurance case in a while. But, as a practical matter, if the agreements are void, why, because of some kind of fraud?

MR. WHEELER: Correct. We will contend in any of these proceedings that Sphere Drake's agent, Euro International, EIU, was without authority to enter into the agreements. They did so in breach of their fiduciary duty. And that Hancock's agent, Sterling Cook, knew they were without authority.

THE COURT: And if that's true of the agreement

-- because, basically, if I address the merits of this

case, I'm essentially trying to discern the intent of the

parties. You know, was there an intent to obligate the

parties to arbitrate in Massachusetts? And none of them

have expressed forum selection clause, although one of

them makes reference to another agreement that says

Massachusetts.

service that we will arbitrate as this court ultimately directs.

THE COURT: But if I -- I mean, one of the things -- well, do you intend for me to take up in connection with the motion to dismiss or the motion for preliminary injunction the issue of whether the agreements are void?

MR. WHEELER: We do not, your Honor.

THE COURT: And do you intend to raise that issue at any point in this litigation?

MR. WHEELER: Not in this litigation, your Honor. Wherever this court or the court in England ultimately directs that the arbitration go forward, we expect to raise that argument in the context of the arbitration, that the contracts are void.

THE COURT: And if I applied Judge Saris' framework for analysis and stayed this litigation pending a decision by the court in London, the court in London could decide to send the case to Massachusetts for arbitration, in your view?

MR. WHEELER: Yes.

THE COURT: Or at least it could decline to order arbitration in England and say, I think

Massachusetts is more appropriate. And then you all could come back to me, and I would likely order